[Shri V. Narayana Samy]

It is on record and it can be verified.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Then let us do one thing. You can finish off with clarifications and then discuss the Industrial Policy.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: It should be taken up now. That is the consensus of the House.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: May I make a suggestion? If they are so keen, let us start with the Industrial Policy. We may sit upto 6 o'clock, because they say we have not given them previous notice. Today only we decide that tomorrow even if you are to sit up till 8 or 9, we will continue that. Today we can carry on upto 6 o'clock.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: I want to say something on what Prof. Dandavate has said. (*Interruptions*) Here I am referring to the precedent. It happened like this earlier. It was said if the Opposition was not prepared, we shall sit and consume our time and as far as the time of the Opposition is concerned, that will speak the next day. It was done like that. If they want to sit upto 6 o'clock, they can utilise that time. But we will utilise our time next day. We will not sit beyond 6 o'clock. It is on record and we shall go accordingly.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION ON THE NEW INDUSTRIAL POLICY—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now, we will take up Industrial policy and we will try to conclude it today.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): That means I will not be required for replying to the clarifications today.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now, Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR (Bihar): What about Pramod Mahajan?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Pramod Mahajan is not here. You can begin.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): No.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: You cannot speak for him.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: We have substituted Mr. Sikander Bakht's name in the place of Mr. Pramod Mahajan.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I am calling Mr. Sikander Bakht's name.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त (मध्य प्रदेश) : इतना नान सीरियस बना दिया है कि ...(**व्यवधान**) क्या कोई जेहन बनाएगा बोलने के लिए। मैं बहुत ज्यादा माफी चाहता हूं।

मैं एक ऐसे विषय पर बोलने की जसारत कर रहा हूं जिससे मेरा दूर का भी कोई संबंध नहीं है। मुझे कितने मिनट बोलना है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री भास्कर अन्नाजी मासोदकर) : आपकी पार्टी का टाइम 11 मिनट है।

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : तो मैं अपनी इस बेबसी के लिए एक लफ्ज यहां

कह सकता हूं उसको मजहूल अल्फाज कहते हैं। माहरीनेफन के अल्फाज की जादूगरी से मैं वाकिफ हूं, कायल हूं। सदर साहब मुझे सुनिये, सेक्रेट्री साहब तशरीफ रखिए।

...(*Interruptions*)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): You know the tradtions of the House. Consulations will be going on.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : माहरीनेफन के अल्फाज की जादूगरी, सदर साहब मैं जानता हूं, उसकी जगह भी है और दुरुस्त भी है, मुनासिब भी है। लेकिन साधारण शहरी को हक है कि वे साधारण शब्दावली में अपने मुल्क के उन मामलात को समझें जो इस देश में हो रहे हैं और उस पर वे अपना राय बना सकें। इस सरकार की बहुत सारी पालिसीज से मुझे इत्तिफाक नहीं है। लेकिन इस घुटन के आलम में अगर कोई छोटी सी खिड़की खुले और उसमें से कोई ताजा हवा का झोंका आये तो दाद दिये बगैर कोई इन्सान रह नहीं सकता। सदर साहब, न्यू नेशनल पालिसी इसको कहा गया है। नेशनल पालिसी को मुझे मालूम नहीं न्यू क्यों कहा गया है। लेकिन मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूं और इस पालिसी के लाने वाले मंत्री महोदय को मुबारकबाद देता हूं कि उन्होंने नाराजगी की जंजीरों को तोड़ने की कोशिश की है। नाराजगी की बात, सदर साहब मैंने इसलिए कही कि हम लोग अक्सर नारों में इस शिद्दत से मुब्तिला होते हैं, नारों की खुद गिरफ्तारी में इतनी शिद्दत से मब्तिला होते हैं कि नारे खुद दलील हो जाते हैं। नारे के पीछे असलियत क्या है, सच्चाई क्या है, उसका विश्लेषण, तजजिया करने की जरूरत नहीं रहती है। तानाशाही करने का मेरा कोई इरादा नहीं है। लेकिन अपने मुल्क की बात कहना चाहता हूं, अपने मुल्क की जरूरतों की बात कहना चाहता हूं, साधारण शब्दों में, साधारण शहरियों की समझ में आये उन अल्फाजों में बात कहना चाहता हूं ताकि वे नारों के क्लिचेज से नारों के जाल से बाहर आ सकें और उनके मुल्क में क्या हो रहा है इसको समझ सकें। मैं अपनी बात को बुनियादी सवालात से शुरू करना चाहता हूं। बुनियादी सवालात हमारे सामने क्या हैं?

सब से पहला और सब से बड़ा सवाल यह है कि मुल्क में दौलत पैदा की जाए। दौलत पैदा करने के रास्ते में जो रुकावटें हैं, उनको दूर किया जाए, सियासी नारों में डूब कर उन रुकावटों को कायम रखने की कोशिश न की जाए।

प्रोडक्टिविटी बढ़ाई जाए, प्रोडक्टिविटी की रफ्तार बढ़ाई जाए, प्रोडक्टिविटी की रफ्तार के रास्ते में कमी पैदा करने वाली रुकावटों को दूर किया जाए। कंज्यूमर को सस्ता माल दिया जाए, कंज्यूमर को बेहतर क्वालिटी का माल दिया जाए, कम्पीटीशन के दरवाजे जितने खोले जा सकते हों, वह खोले जाएं।

सदर साहब, मैं अपनी बात को दो हिस्सों में तकसीम करना चाहता हूं--एक तो यह कि इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी क्या बातें लेकर आई है? क्या नई बातें उसने कही हैं, अगर नई बात हुई हो? मुझे लगता नहीं कि कोई नई बात हुई हो।

दूसरे एतराजात---पहले मैं इस इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी में जो नई बातें कही गई हैं, कुछ उसके बारे में कहना चाहता हूं। इस इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी के जरिए से सिर्फ यह किया गया है, पुरानी बातें हैं, मिक्सड पालिसी है, स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी की तरक्की है, वगैरह-वगैरह। कोई नई बात नहीं है। नई बात है तो केवल इतनी कि ब्यरोक्रेटिक कंट्रोल कम हों, डी-लाइसेंसिंग के लिए कदम उठाये गये हैं, नान-बैकवर्ड एरियाज में पांच करोड़ से पच्चीस करोड़ तक की इनवेस्टमेंट की गुंजाईस रखी गई है,

[श्री सिकन्दर बख्त]

बैकवर्ड एरियाज के लिए 75 करोड़ रुपये मुकर्रर किये गये हैं। इन इनवेस्टमेंट्स पर लाइसेंस वगैरह की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी---इस बात का ऐलान किया गया है, अफसरशाही का कंट्रोल कम हुआ है और काम की रफ्तार बढ़ी है।

इम्पोर्ट आफ कैपिटल गुड्स के संबंध में भी--अब मैं कोटेशन में वक्त जाया नहीं करना चाहता हूं--एंटरप्रेन्योर को हक दिया गया है कि वह प्लांट और मशीनरी को 30 फीसदी की कीमत तक माल का इम्पोर्ट कर सकते हैं। प्रोसीजरल उलझनों को खत्म करके एफिशेंसी लाने की कोशिश की गई है।

स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज की प्रोमोशन, क्योंकि आम तौर पर एतराज आते हैं, इसका बहुत जिक्र किया गया है, बहुत साफ तौर पर कोशिश करने की बात कही गई है। 836 आईटम्स ऐसे रखे गये हैं कि जो स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज के लिए मखसूस किये गये हैं। उसका दायरा बढ़ाने की कोशिश की गई है। प्लांट एंड मशीनरी की इम्पोर्ट की हद को 35 लाख से बढ़ा कर 60 लाख करने की कोशिश की गई है।

इंजीनियरिंग यूनिट्स के लिए 35 लाख से बढ़ा कर 75 लाख किया गया है। ऐसे यूनिट्स के लिए जो तीन साल तक के लिए अपना माल कम से कम 30 प्रतिशत माल एक्सपोर्ट करते रहेंगे, वह अपनी मशीनरी वगैरह में 75 लाख रुपये तक लगा सकते हैं। जाहिर है कि यह तमाम कदम स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज को बढ़ावा देने के लिए है और जो एतराज स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज के थ्रेटलिंग के संबंध में दिये गये हैं, वह सब बेमानी बेमकसद हैं।

एतराज की बात--इस नई पालिसी के सिलसिले में सब से ज्यादा दिलचस्प पहलू एतराज का यह है कि बहरूनी इनवेस्टमेंट से हिंदुस्तान के मल्टी-नेशनल्ज को खुली छुट्टी मिल जाएगी। अब यह एतराज की कारफरमाई तमाम पुराने विलशेज पर, पुराने नारों पर मुनस्सर है।

मझे ताज्जुब होता है कि इस संबंध में कुछ जगहों से मेरे कान में आवाज पड़ी है कि वही कैफियत पैदा हो जाएगी जो ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी के आने से हुई थी। क्षमा करेंगे यह बिलकुल बचकाना बात है। वह जमाने गये कि जिस तरीके से तिजारती कम्पनियां आएं और मुल्कों पर कब्जा कर लें। वह जमाने अंग्रेजों की पाइरेसी के जमाने--आज कल तो पाइरेसी का कोई नामो-निशान नहीं है। जो खिड़कियां खोली गई हैं, इन खिड़कियों के अंदर किसी बड़ी कम्पनी के आने के इमकानात हैं ही नहीं। इन खिड़कियों के जरिए से तो बहुत छोटे इनवेस्टमेंट के इमकानात बढ़ते हैं, जिसके जरिए एन.आर.आई. के आने के इमकानात बढ़ते हैं, माडर्न टैकनालोजी के आने के इमकानात बढ़ते हैं। मल्टी-नेशनल्ज के कन्ट्रोल का सवाल कहां पैदा होता है? फारेन इन्वेस्टमेंट पर एतराजात करने पर मुझे सब से बड़ा ताज्जुब इस बात पर है, वह यह है कि यह मुल्क फारेन कर्जे में डूबा हुआ है। 100 हजार करोड़ के करीब हम फारेन कर्जे में डूबे हुए हैं। हमें इस कर्ज को भी अदा करना है और हमें कर्जे पर जो सूद है उसे भी अदा करना है। उसकी तरफ से यह बिलकुल बेखबर है। लेकिन यह जो रियायतें दी गई हैं इसके जरिए से हमको डर यह लग रहा है कि हम यहां तक इस मुल्क में मल्टी-नेशनल्ज के कंट्रोल को और कब्जे को ले आयेंगे, समझ में जरूरत नहीं आती, 40 परसेंट इक्विटी के जरिए से मल्टी-नेशनल्ज हमारे मुल्क की इंडस्ट्रीज पर काबिज हो जाएंगे? अव्वल तो काबिज होने वाले कौन हैं, विस्तार क्या है, कितने बड़े हैं? दूसरे 40 परसेंट इक्विटी कब्जे की दर तो नहीं होगी, 50 फीसदी से आगे बढ़ने के बाद ही हो सकती है। 40 परसेंट इक्विटी अगर किसी फारेन कंपनी ने यहां आकर कुछ लगाया हो, दूसरा एतराज कुछ मुनाफा बाहर चला जाएगा। अगर मुनाफा कमाने के बाद बाहर चला जाए तो क्या एतराज

हो रहा है मुनाफा न हो इसकी तरफ ज़िद करने का मकसद बिल्कुल समझ में नहीं आया। मुनाफा होने का मतलब यह है कि दौलत पैदा हो रही है, पैदावार बढ़ रही है, उसमें से कुछ हिस्सा जाएगा। मुनाफा न हो ज्यादा बेहतर लगता है और उसकी तरफ हमारी नज़र नहीं है कि पब्लिक सैक्टर के अन्दर 300 हजार करोड़ का इंन्वेस्टमेंट है। ज्यादातर पब्लिक सैक्टर्ज़ सिक हैं। 300 हजार, आई थिंक आई एम राइट... (**व्यवधान**) रफली है, 10 परसेंट का उसका रिटर्न उसका सूद का होगा तो 30 हजार करोड़ रुपये की सालाना आमदनी हिन्दुस्तान की होनी चाहिए, जो नहीं हो रही है और उस पर हमको तवज्जह नहीं है। नुकसानात आज हमारे यहां सिक इंडस्ट्रीज के हैं उसकी तरफ तवज्जह नहीं है। माल पैदा करने वाले, दौलत पैदा करने वाले अगर इन छोटी-छोटी खिड़कियों के जरिए से कोई यहां मुनाफा पैदा करने वाली कंपनियां खोली जाएं, बाहर कोई कुछ टैक्नोलोजी आए और उस मुनाफे का कुछ हिस्सा बाहर चला जाए, काबिले एतराज बात है। मेरी यह बात बिल्कुल समझ में नहीं आती, मोनोपली हाउसेज का भी बहुत जिक्र होता है। जब हमारे यहां नारे शुरू होते हैं और आज भी कुछ जिक्र हो रहा था अहलुवालिया साहब ने कुछ पेट्रोल का, कुछ जिक्र हमारे वित्त मंत्री साहब ने किया था। यानी एक तरफ तो मोनोपली हाउसेज के खिलाफ शिकायतों का अंबार है और दूसरी तरफ यह है कि प्रोटेक्शन के नाम पर जो कुछ चल रहा है, जो कुछ बन रहा है, वह मुसलसल बनता रहे। कारज़ की बात है: पेट्रोल हमको बचाना है' फ्यूल एफ़ीशिएंसी की बात हुई है। बाहर से फ्यूल एफ़ीशिएंट कारज़ का आना बंद होना चाहिए। हिन्दुस्तान में पेट्रोल पीने वाली गाड़ियां हैं। जंक्स पैदा होती रहनी चाहिए। हम मल्टी-नेशनल्ज के खिलाफ़ शिकायतों की आवाज भी उठाते हैं और मल्टी-नेशनल्ज को प्रोटेक्शन भी देते हैं और प्रोटेक्शन के नाम पर अब मान लीजिए फ्यूल एफ़ीशिएंट कारज़ का आना शुरू होता है तो जो मजबूरियां और पाबंदियां आजकल फ्यूल के इस्तेमाल के संबंध में लगाई जा रही हैं बच सकते हैं। कल का भी जिक्र नहीं है। मैं आज ईमानदारी से समझ नहीं सका कि हमारे फ़ाइनांस मिनिस्टर साहब ने अहलुवालिया साहब की अमेंडमेंट को क्यों मंजूर नहीं किया? वह मुझे मालूम है। सीधी-सादी बात थी कि जो पाबंदी आपने आजकल मिडल-ईस्ट हालात के पेंशनर पेट्रोल के इस्तेमाल पर लगाने की कोशिश की है। अगर कल मिडल-ईस्ट के हालात दुरुस्त हो जाते हैं क्या आप इन पाबंदियों को हटा लेंगे? मुझे लगता नहीं कि ऐसे होगा। वह जहां एक दफ़ा आ जाते हैं उससे पीछे हटने का सवाल पैदा नहीं होता मैं शायद डाइग्रेस कर रहा हूं। मेरा मकसद एक है कि आपको यहां कंपीटीशन लाना चाहिए ताकि हम हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को अब वह आजकल कार का रखना कोई बहुत रईसों का सिलसिला नहीं है, यह तो बिल्कुल एक जिन्दगी की जरूरत बन चुकी है। मगर फ्यूअल कम-से-कम लगे, पेट्रोल बचे, पेट्रोल का खर्चा कम हो, कम्पीटीशन हो, बेहतर गाड़ियां बनें, जंक्स की जगह बेहतर गाड़ियां बनें। वहां मोनोपोली हाउसेज को प्रोटेक्शन देने का सिलसिला है लेकिन बेहतर गाड़ियां हम बनाना नहीं चाहते हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य: बिड़ला जी का घर कैसे चलेगा?

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त: वह तो आप ही बताएंगे। आप करीब बैठे हैं। आप पूछिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री भास्कर अन्नाजी मासोदकर): बख्त साहब, आप को कितना टाइम चाहिए?

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त: जी मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि गवर्नमेंट को क्या-क्या करना चाहिए! मैंने यह अर्ज किया था कि सिर्फ़ इन्होंने कुछ जंजीरों को, नारों की जंजीरों को तोड़ने की इब्तदा की हैं। मैं यह नहीं मानता कि बहुत लंबा-चौड़ा कमाल कर दिया है और हिन्दुस्तान की इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी में कोई इंकलाब आ गया है और हिन्दुस्तान में दौलत की बारिस होने लगी है। इसलिए मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि जो कुछ भी आप लेकर आए हैं, वह एक किस्म की स्पेसिफ़ाइड लिस्ट है। इसलिए एक तो मेहरबानी यह करें कि साफ़-साफ़ तौर पर इस किस्म की फ़ेहरिस्त लाइए जिसमें यह पता लगे कि वे कौनसे सेक्टर्स हैं जिसमें सरकार की मंजूरी की जरूरत नही पड़ती, एक ऐसी फ़ेहरिस्त लाइए कि इस तरह के सेक्टर्स सरकार की मंजूरी के बाद चल सकते हैं। तीसरे, वह फ़ेहरिस्त लाइए जिससे यह पता चले कि इस किस्म के सेक्टर्स मंजूरी के बाद भी नहीं चल सकते। एक भरपूर दस्तावेज बाकायदा इंडस्ट्रियल और इनवेस्टमेंट पालिसी के संबंध में लाएं पब्लिक सेक्टर को सुधारने के बारे में और कौन-कौनसे ऐसे पब्लिक सेक्टर्स हैं, ऐसे पब्लिक सेक्टर में कंपनियां हैं जिनका रुख मुनाफ़े की तरफ़ मोड़ना नामुमकिन है, क्या उन को बंद करने के बारे में भी आप सोच रहे हैं! पब्लिक सेक्टर के बारे में एक काम्प्रेहेंसिव टोटल पॉलिसी कि, क्या सुधार आप लाना चाहते हैं, वह बताएं।

डिरेगुलेशन के सिलसिले में कुछ झिझक-झिझक कर कदम उठाए हैं। ऐसे कुछ भरपूर कदम उठाइए ताकि नाराजगी से बाहर आकर हिंदुस्तान में पैदावार का सिलसिला बढ़ सके। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now the Congress-(I) Party has 12 minutes and three speakers.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we have had a great fight for the Industrial Policy.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I have heard you. You began to speak. Let us see how we control ourselves. It is our own time that we are regulating. It is not anybody's time... (*Interruptions*)... You must see the dilemma. You don't want to sit beyond six. You don't want to adhere to your own schedule.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Sir, I am happy that we are out of one dilemma as to whether we are going to discuss or not the Industrial Policy Resolution. We are on the point of discussing it. I have heard with great respect Shri Sikander Bakhtji, but I was baffled; initially he congratulated the Industrial Policy as well as the Minister who has brought it and in the end he said, "There is no likelihood of a revolution coming as a result of that and perhaps there is no promise of prosperity to this Policy." I am not sure whether he has congratulated him with his tongue in cheek.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त: मैंने पहले भी कहा था कि मामूली-सी खिड़की खुली है। मैं चाहता हूं कि भरपूर सिलसिला सो उस में कोई कांट्रेडिक्सन न हो

प्रो० चन्द्रेश पी. ठाकुर: मामली सी खुली है इस पर एतराज था। पूरी खले उस पर आपका समर्थन है।

Sir, you will appreciate that this Government, howsoever inefficient or confused it is, has some good Ministers and I thought Mr. Ajit Singh, if for nothing else, at least as a part of our brotherhood because he belonged to this House once and I know his background, is a very competent person and his thinking is clear, but, I am afraid, he has bosses who bring a situation where he feels hamstrung. The most

classical case is, here is a policy where he has not been allowed to move his second foot. It is an incomplete policy. It is a confused policy and it shows the ambivalence and contradictions or the conflicts within the powers that be. I am just looking at one of the issues of "Business India," which is widely read for facts and comments, of June 11—24 of this year. I will just draw the attention of the House, through you, to some of the photographs and the notes under them. Here is a photograph of Mr. Madhu Dandavate, "Not happy with the policy; control, recontrol". The next photograph of an allegedly very powerful Minister, Mr. Arun Nehru, "Lobbying for wider liberalisation". Then there is another Minister's smiling face, "Beginning the process of change". Then, at a later stage in continuation of that cover article there is a photograph of the Prime Minister who says, "Not succumbing to the pressure of the monopoly houses". These are the different faces of one Government. If these are the different faces, is it still one Government, one thinking ? Let us go further. I said he is a good person. But his portfolio is tempting to the point that one of his learned colleagues is always trying to barge into it. He initially lost the chance of getting that portfolio. But he still thinks that he is the Industry Minister. Everytime he opens his mouth, at least for some part of it, he says one way or the other something on the industrial policy. The third point is, we understand that the Prime Minister is a leader who is seeking national consensus. I think charity begins at home. First, is there a Cabinet consensus on industrial policy ? Is there a consensus within the Janata Dal so far as industrial policy is concerned ? Mr. Ajit Singh Mr. Arun Nehru, Mr. George Fernandes, are all members of the same Cabinet and the same party. Then there are members of the Janata Dal who are not in the Government. Mr. Chandrasekhar who is an eminent leader of that party, whether he is still a power behind the throne or is after the throne, speaks for a good number of people representing that party. We know and it is public knowledge as to what his stand has been on the industrial policy. Then we have the other very senior colleague Mr. Dipen Ghosh who is one of the real powers behind this cracking throne and he spoke with great eloquence on what this was all about...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): If you are speaking of personalities, you can take all the names of the Members.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: No; I am only trying to point out...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Professor, we should avoid taking names. That will be better.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I respect their views. I respect their positions...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): I know, But still, ...

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: What I am trying to draw attention to is that collectively they create a catastrophic situation so far as the industrial policy resolution is concerned. That is the main point I am trying to make. And unless there is a policy—policy is a guide to action—and unless there is a good policy direction, the subsequent actions are likely to be a non-starter. If anything, they

are going to work at cross purposes.

They have cried hoarse on what they got from the previous Government. Let me remind the House, and particularly the honourable Minister, that this Government got in terms of industrial scene a situation where there was 9% of growth rate during the '80s, 10% value-added during the period 81-82 to 86-87 and a buoyancy of the capital market, to be seen to be believed. Then the consumers got a fair deal at least in certain commodities in terms of quality, in terms of product range choice, in terms of quick delivering against their demand. Then the technological modernisation gathered momentum which added to competitiveness. If this is the kind of a happy situation at that time so far as industrial policy was concerned, then what was it that they did not get in terms of a good gift from the previous Government ? The question I am asking is: Are they capable of sustaining this level of growth, this rate of growth and this quality of growth so far as the industrial sector is concerned ? Can they gather courage and take a position on the floor of the House that we will maintain it if not improve upon it ? I am raising an accusing finger, they are not in a position as a result of the policy paralysis and the wrong messages they are giving to the industrial community, domestic or foreign. as a result of internal bickerings, they are creating a condition where they will have difficulties in sustaining this rate of growth and we should not be surprised, the country should not be surprised, if the industrial scene gets into the reverse gear. They would allege that Mr. Devi Lal wanted everything for the rural sector and we do not have money and we do not have all kinds of things for industry. But the fact remains that during the eighties, industrial India has seen progress, remarkable progress, in terms of rate of growth, in terms of quality, which led to the penetration of our industrial products in the international market of a much better kind.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to submit that so far as development is concerned, there is the Planning Commission and I do not know whether the policy is being made in the Prime Minister's office or in the Ministry of Industry or in the Planning Commission or in none of these places. If all these places are contributors to the policy-making, they are not contribution to the emergence of any coherent policy. I do not like to quote personalities because you object to quotations. So, I will not mention what Mr. Hegde, while he was the Deputy Chairman of the Plnning Commission said or what Mr. Jain, a Member of the Planning Commission said or what other people are saying. In any case, some of these heads have rolled though for entirely different reasons.

Now, my question is this: what is going to be the status of the public sector enterprises? If Sikander Bakhtji is one of the powers behind the throne and if what he said is to be taken into account, then the public sector is going to face problems. It is not only Mr. Sikander Bakht and people like him have said something about this, but also the Prime Minister has a said some thing. The Prime Minister was to attend one of the recently held annual conferences of the heads of public sector enterprises. Firstly, it is a classic case of discourtesy to an august meeting because the Prime Minister was to be there, but did not attend the conference. Even the speech of the Prime Minister was not read out by the Minister, but by the Secretary only. I have all respect for the Secretary concerned. But what is the message that the Prime Minister had tried to communicate to the chief executive who had gathered there in that meeting? What does the message

convey? The message is that there is a risk of a plan holiday! It was a threat rather than a support. After all, as the head of the Government, if the heads of the public sector enterprises working under your charge or under the charge of your Government come to you, you need to support those heads. They come here to seek your blessings, to seek your support, to seek clarifications on your policy, to seek modifications, if any. But what they get is only a threat. When I read about it, I was also surprised and I thought that the reports may be wrong. But, later on, what I heard was that there was a great disappointment among them and they did not know whether this Government is for or against the public sector. Is this Government for the public enterprises or against the public enterprises? I am not suggesting that everything is great about the public sector enterprises. But, together, all the public sector enterprises have given the muscle-power to our economy, to this country's industrial Programme and economic policies. Self-reliance we have got. I am sure that they have not come to a point where they will say that it is not needed.

I will come to some of the specific points in this connection later. But the fact remains that the policy of this Government with regard to the public enterprises remains to be defined and the operating heads of the public enterprises are not going to perform any better in view of the fact that there might be a sudden change in the policy.

Now, everybody knows that these people, when they were here on this side of the House, were discussing the economic policy and they talked and talked hoarse about the sickness, industrial sickness, and the policy of the Government to revive the sick units. We are now having about 1,75,000 sick industrial units and about six thousand crores of rupees are sunk in the large sick units and roughly about one thousand six hundred crores in small enterprises. There is a body called the Board of Industrial and Financial Reconstruction. But what is the degree of revival? Firstly, how many units are there in the portfolio of the Board of Industrial and Financial Reconstruction? What is the rate of the turn-around of those which are on the portfolio of this body? Is it working as a judicial body or is it working as a rehabilitation body? And, beyond that, this body is not responsible for the sick public enterprises. There have been talks that there is going to be a parallel body for the sick public sector enterprises. But nothing is clear. So, unless some of these questions are asked and answers to them are found, it will be difficult and the entire network of the managers involved in the management of the public enterprises will remain confused. Those who have stakes in the sick units, they will still remain confused. So where are we heading towards? If you think that there is an industrial policy for...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude...

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR:...for which my friend congratulated him, then these are still big holes in the so called industrial policy; there are big gaps. Now, the policy says that among other things it wants to have regional balanced development. In this House I have talked and talked any number

of times that this country for remaining together requires regional balanced development, and industrial location is one of the vehicles for bringing regional balance. And to the extent the Government is earnest—I hope it is earnets—I welcome that. But what exactly is the pace of regional balance ? It does not come by simply wishing ? It requires a certain concrete steps. There should be balanced infrastructural facilities. I will give a concrete case. I come from the State of Bihar.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR) : Please conclude, You have already taken 13 minutes. Unless we go on endlessly, if the House agrees, I have no obiection.

ROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKFR : They are likely to sit beyond six.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR) : If you agree, I have no objection.

Prof. Thakur, just see the situation. Your party had 12 minutes. And you have already crossed..

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: At the moment I am speaking for myself.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): No, you are speaking as a representative of the Congress Party (*Interruptions*) I am sure he has not ..(*Interruptions*)

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I do have a party, and a very respectable party at that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR) : Please conclude. (*Interruptions*).

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: If the wisdom is lying on this side of the House, let them have the benefit of listening, (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Wisdom lies in speaking within the confines of time.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: This Government—you have heard—requires repeated, long, loud saying for it to make.. (*Interruptions*) The point I am trying to make is..(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA (Bihar): If he is allowed to finish his speech at 6 o'clock, then the House will not sit. What about the others?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODHKAR) There are other Members to participate..(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, he has already consumed a lot of time. If at 6 o'clock..(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Leave something to the Chair. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, he is also on the panel of Vice-Chairman. Let him behave properly. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not have to learn the norms of behaviour from them. If I have to learn, there are better places to learn. (*Interruptions*) It does not behave a respectable Member of the House to comment in the way he has cared to comment. (*Interruptons*)

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN : Is he not wasting the time ?

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: You are wasting still further..

[Prof Chandresh P Thakur]

(*Interruptions*) Do you think you have a licence to waste somebody else's time? (*Interrutptions*) He has asked me to learn to behave. Next he is saying that I am a member on the panel of Vice-Chairman. It is because he is not a panel Member, he continues to misbehave.. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKER ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude.

SHRI AJIT P.K. JOGI (Madhya Pradesh): Every Member has a right to say what he wants to to say.

AN HON. MEMBER: Within the confines of time.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: The Industrial Policy Resolution has become a bugbear. Sir, for some reason, either the Government or the supporting parties, or the whole lot of them, the rotten lot, are not interested in any discussion on the industrial policy. A bargain counter is being put against this Industrial Policy Resolution—it should be next day, it should be after this item, it should be taken up on the condition that after six we will start and we still sit till midnight, and so on. We will sit till mid-night. What is happening? What kind of a thing we are looking at? Why are they so much afraid of discussing the Industrial Policy? In any case, they are naked so far as the policy aspect is concerned. Why do they want all kinds of alibis? What is the kind of Industrial Policy that we are looking for?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude?

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: How can I conclude?

THE VICE-CHIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Don't talk amongft yourselves. Address the Chair

PROF. CHANDRESH P. R. THAKUR: Mr. Vice-Chairman if he had patience, I was going to say omething which he would have heard with pleasure.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): You can discuss it in the lobby.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: The point I am trying to make is that if the regional balance is to come, then what is important is that there is need for the backward States to get priority. Mr. Sukomal Sen, if you are born and brought up in West Bengal and if you still loyal to your soil, you will enjoy what I am going to say. States like Bihar, West Bengal, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh have suffered for two decades under the freight equalisation scheme. It is the imbecility of the political leaders and their State Governments collectively, regardless of the political parties in power there who have not been able to assert their claims. When the representatives from those States come and there is a discussion on the Industrial Policy, then they are putting up all the fetters here. I am ashamed of them. If I were born in that State, I would have raised my voice with all kinds of arguments that these States must get priority.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is not the imbecility of those State Governments that they could not get the policy changed. On the contrary, the various Governments of those States have been demanding this every year in the meetings and in the national fora such as the Chief Ministers' Conference and the National Development Council. But the Governments, neither the previous Government nor the present Government, have been caring to listen to them. That is the unfortunate part of it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Let us hear the hon. Mem-

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I am sure you are looking at my face and seeing whether I am going to conclude or not. The point I am trying to make is that for the benefit of these States and for the benefit of the possibility of implementation of the policy of regional balance, there is need to scrap this freight equalisation scheme and there is need to scrap the consignment tax. There is need to create a condition so that the industrial units are located at the origin of major mineral points. (*Interruptions*) you are not even prepared to listen to things which you would like. (*Interruptions*) Take the State of Bihar. The population of Bihar is ten per cent of the national population. I would submit for the consideration of the Government, through you, one thing. Of all the letters of intent issued during the next ten years, at least 10 per cent of them will go to units likely to be located in Bihar. Whether it is investment in infra-structure or it is power or national highways or railway network, 10 per cent of all these should be set aside for the State of Bihar in deference to its population being 10 per cent of the country. Let us not forget that the rate of growth of Bihar is falling behind the rate of national growth and that gap is growing. (*Interruptions*) Bihar is going in reverse gear. The ruling party has 50 Members in Lok Sabha and a farily good number here. I hope collectively, with our support also..(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Chaturanan Mishra, you are going to speak on this.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: This policy should have been suggested, because it is promotive of small and medium size industries, that ancilliarisation should get priority. Ancilliarisation is one of the vehicles through which small and medium industries grow along with large enterprises. Along with Mr. Dipen Ghosh, I am also a Member of the Committee on Public Enterprises. We were visiting some of the units in Chota Nagpur. The state of ancillary development is deplorable whether it is Bokaro Steel Plant, whether it is Heavy Engineering Corporation or whether they are coal-based industries. If you ask the question whether the ancillary units are growing, the answer comes that so much money has been spent on purchases. Whether the purchase is from the Calcutta market or the Delhi market is a matter of crucial detail. Whether the purchase is through the local ancillary units should be a matter of real curiosity. So, it is not only the money for investment. The whole question is as to how many new units have been identified, and whether it is through ancillarisation or other channels of small firms' development. We need the small firms to grow. But I would like to daw the attention of the Government to the state of industrial estates. Industrial estates are littered all over the country. They have just land and sheds converted into godowns. And all the licences issued are being used for procuring raw materials and selling them at a premium. So, will the Government consider the policy of really effectively using the facilities created under the industrial estates? In the earlier incarnation, the Janta Party Government introduced the policy of district industry centres. For some reason, the district industry centres have continued. But what are their contribution? And some light might be brought to them.

Now, none of these will grow unless the term-lending agencies are brought to behave. There is the creation of the previous Government, the SIDBI a subsidiary of

[Prof Chandresh P Thakur]

the Industrial Finance Corporation, specifically to look after the needs of the small firms. Now, are the officers who are working there are again of the same habit and attitude, of the mind they had while they were in the IDBI? Or, have they acquired new attitudes and new priorities? And are they working on that? So, I would submit that if there is a meeting of the mind between the hon. Minister of Industry and the hon. Minister of Finance who is the boss of the Industrial Finance Corporation and its subsidiary, then there should be a more vigorous promotion of healthy, economically viable new small units. In this context, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you need not only money and letters of intent but you also need the right kind of entrepreneurs, first generation entrepreneurs with competence, with professional background and market support. But, Sir, the other day I heard that it has been decided to close down one of the units under the Ministry of Industry, the National Institute of Small Firms and Enterprises Development or whatver it is . That was an institute which was created for identifying and training entrepreneurs for the purpose of small firms development. On the one side, you want to..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Professor saheb, now I have to call the next Speaker. I did not want to disturb you.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: I am concluding; I am making my last point. Sir, here is a contradiction in terms. On the one side you want to promote entrepreneurs and small firms, and on the other, you are closing down an institution which you created for the same purpose. How do you justify this kind of contradiction ? So, I will submit, Sir, that the Government should show a certain degree of seriousness, and [illegible] make its policy clearer. [illegible] show what will be the status of the public enterprises, what will be the status of the private investment, what will be the status of the multinationals. There is supposed to be a negative or a positive list. That list should come out so that the investing community will know it. And beyond that, so far as the infra-structure is concerned, it should be given priority on a balanced basis. And a policy towards sick units must see the front burner. And ancillarisation should be promoted. And for all this, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we need a policy which is still missing. We need instruments which, perhaps, have been there, but somewhat rusted, and they need to be sharpened. But much more than that, we need a political will. But a collapsing Government can hardly gather the political will. So, we all together should pray to the God that it survives and acquires political will to implement a policy, as and when they emerge with certain degree of clarity.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, first of all, I welcome certain stipulations made in this policy statement. For example, it has been stated here:

"In pursuance of our policy to reorient industrial growth to serve the objective of employment generation, dispersal of industry in the rural areas, and to enhance the contribution of small-scale industrial areas, and to enhance the contribution of small-scale industries to exports it has been decided to take the measures enumerated below. But I have certain doubts when I go through the policy statement made by the hon. Minister. I would like to know whether all these things are being helped by raising the investment ceiling in plant and machinery for small-scale industries from Rs. 35 lakhs to Rs. 60 lakhs ? In fact, the organisations repre-